### T

#### Removing export or trade restrictions is untopical—border measures are not restrictions on production

Lothar Ehring (Assistant to Mr. Péter Balás, Deputy Director-General at the Directorate-General for Trade of the European Commission, responsible for multilateral affairs, as well as trade defence instruments and bilateral trade relations with Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Until 2008, Lothar Ehring served in the Unit of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Trade that is responsible for Legal Aspects of Trade Policy. He was the Coordinator for legal issues of multilateral trade, handled several WTO disputes and also represented the European Community in the negotiations on the reform of the WTO Dispute Settlement Understanding) and Gian Franco Chinale 2011 “Regulation of Energy in International Trade Law: Wto, Nafta and Energy Charter” p. 134-5

The perfect example to test and discuss this interpretation is the famous case of OPEC production quotas. These quotas. as implemented at the national levels of OPEC members, are horizontal restrictions on production. They limit exportation no more than domestic sales, and yet the argument is made time and again that they fall foul of Article XI:I of the GATT 1994.” The proponents of this thesis recognize that they are on thin ice. given that production limitations are as remote from being border measures as a restriction can possibly be. Equally clear is the fact that a production limitation definition does not discriminate against exports, neither de jure nor de facto. The proponents of the OPEC GATT-illegality attempt to overcome this conclusion with the argument that for some of the oil exporting countries in question, the near totality of the production goes to export. This. however, is legally irrelevant to the question of whether there is a discrimination against or higher burden on exports. The quantitative relationship between domestic consumption and exports can be very imbalanced for reasons of production and consumption capacities, in large part for reasons of a country’s size and the foreign demand for the product concerned. Also the conceptual argument that a restriction on production can be decomposed into a restriction on exportation as well a restriction on domestic sales is not plausible. The production restriction is precisely and inseparably both at the same time and this makes a qualitative difference that is impossible to set aside.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1. Ground – removing trade barriers lets them avoid relevant production debates and counterplans, which guts the operative topical term and grants them unpredictable external offense and disad answers.

#### 2. Limits – border policy involves a separate lit base that makes it impossible to anticipate topic evolution. Domestic topics are already complex on enough levels that adding a new foreign policy sector makes it unmanageable.

### K

**Energy production brings nature to serve, turning the world into a global gas station, eviscerating and erasing being. The ultimate result is nuclear annihilation and meaninglessness—comparatively outweighs**

Callister 2007 (Paul, Associate Professor of Law and Director of the Leon E. Bloch Law Library, University of Missouri‑Kansas City School of Law. Law and Heidegger’s Question Concerning Technology: Prolegomenon to Future Law Librarianship Law Library Journal [Vol. 99:2)

1 Following World War II, the German philosopher Martin Heidegger offered one of the most potent criticisms of technology and modern life. His nightmare is a world whose essence has been reduced to the functional equivalent of “a giant gasoline station, an energy source for modern technology and industry. This relation of man to the world [is] in principle a technical one. . . . [It is] altogether alien to former ages and histories.”2 For Heidegger, the problem is not technology itself, but the technical mode of thinking that has accompanied it. Such a viewpoint of the world is a useful paradigm to consider humanity’s relationship to law in the current information environment, which is increasingly technical in Heidegger’s sense of the term. 2 Heidegger’s warning that a technical approach to thinking about the world obscures its true essence is directly applicable to the effects of the current (as well as former) information technologies that provide access to law. The thesis of this article is that Heidegger provides an escape, not only for libraries threatened by obsolescence by emerging technologies, but for the law itself, which is under the same risk of subjugation. This article explains the nature of Heidegger’s criticisms of technology and modern life, and explores the threat specifically identified by such criticism, including an illustration based upon systematic revision of law in Nazi Germany. It applies Heidegger’s criticisms to the current legal information environment and contrasts developing technologies and current attitudes and practices with earlier Anglo-American traditions. Finally, the article considers the implications for law librarianship in the current information environment. Heidegger’s Nightmare: Understanding the Beast Calculative Thinking and the Danger of Subjugation to a Single Will 3 The threat is not technology itself; it is rather a danger based in the essence of thinking, which Heidegger describes as “enframing”3 or “calculative thinking.”4 For Heidegger, the problem is that mankind misconstrues the nature of technology as simply “a means to an end.”5 4 Heidegger’s articulation of the common conception of technology as a “means” applies equally well to information technologies, including legal databases. True, it is hard to think of technology in any other way, but what Heidegger argues is that this failure to consider the essence of technology is a threat to humanity.6 5 He defines the threat in two ways. First, humans become incapable of seeing anything around them as but things to be brought into readiness to serve some end (a concept he refers to as “standing reserve”).7 They are thereby cut off from understanding the essence of things and, consequently, their surrounding world.8 Second, man is reduced to the role of “order-er” of things, specifically to some purpose or end, and, as a result, risks becoming something to be ordered as well.9 Heidegger illustrates these concerns as follows: The forester who, in the wood, measures the felled timber and to all appearances walks the same forest path in the same way as did his grandfather is today commanded by profitmaking in the lumber industry, whether he knows it or not. He is made subordinate to the orderability of cellulose, which for its part is challenged forth by the need for paper, which is then delivered to newspapers and illustrated magazines. The latter, in their turn, set public opinion to swallowing what is printed, so that a set configuration of opinion becomes available on demand.10 In other words, the trees, the wood, the paper, and even the forester (whose ancestors once understood the sanctity of the woods) are ultimately subordinated to the will to establish orderly public opinion. The forester, in proverbial fashion, “cannot see the forest for the trees.” Instead of appreciating the majesty and mystery of the living forest, he sees only fodder for the paper mill, which will pay for his next meal. 6 The same cynicism might be applied to legal publishing. Whole forests have given their lives to the publication of legal information in order to provide a stable basis for society—after all, the “law must be stable and yet it cannot stand still,”11 or as our comrades from Critical Legal Studies might put it, law is simply a tool “to perpetuate the existing socioeconomic status quo.”12 Cadres of West editors (commonly referred to in generic fashion as human resources, ironically making them all the less human)13 work feverishly to digest points of law and assign 55,000 cases into a taxonomy with more than 100,000 class distinctions,14 all for the sake of a predictable legal system and stable society. 7 For Heidegger, the threat is revealed in mankind’s perpetual quest to gain mastery over technology. “Everything depends on our manipulating technology in the proper manner as a means. We will, as we say, ‘get’ technology ‘spiritually in hand.’ We will master it. The will to mastery becomes all the more urgent the more technology threatens to slip from human control.”15 When Heidegger published these words (first in 1962, but based on lectures from 1949 and 1950),16 the implications of nuclear energy and atomic warfare occupied much academic discussion. Heidegger points out that the popular question of this period did not concern how to find sufficient energy resources, but “[i]n what way can we tame and direct the unimaginably vast amounts of atomic energies, and so secure mankind against the danger that these gigantic energies suddenly—even without military actions— break out somewhere, ‘run away’ and destroy everything?”17 The modern question is about our mastery over technology, not about sufficiency of resources. 8 Similar concerns are apparent with respect to information technologies, where the primary problem is not lack of access, but too much access: for example, illegal music file swapping,18 the anti-circumvention provisions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA),19 and trends to use licensing to control and preserve the economic value of information (and to prohibit otherwise lawfully competitive practices, such as reverse engineering).20 With respect to law and government, we see such examples as retraction of government documents,21 the Patriot Act,22 the furor over unpublished electronic precedent,23 and the recent frenzy of e-discovery.24 Some stakeholders seem to have liked things better when information resources were scarce.25 Universal access is destabilizing—hence, the considerable interest in getting a “handle” on technology through legal sanction and yet additional technological innovation (the so-called “access control” technologies). 26 9 Heidegger’s genius is in recognizing that all the fuss about mastering technologies, although close to the mark, concerns the wrong issue. The more insidious threat is not nuclear fallout or economic devaluation of intellectual property, but the worldview of “calculative” thinking that accompanies rapid technological change: “The world now appears as an object open to attacks of calculative thought, attacks that nothing is believed able any longer to resist.”27 For Heidegger, calculative thought is not limited to the manipulation of machine code or numbers. Rather, the concept is grounded in “Machiavellian scheming” and the pursuit of power. “Calculative thinking computes. It computes ever new, ever more promising and at the same time more economical possibilities. Calculative thinking races from one prospect to the next.”28 The threat Heidegger envisions to human thought is even more dangerous than nuclear warfare.29 10 Heidegger’s threat is based on the separation of man from his or her nature. By pursuing economic calculation, man is cut off from the transformative powers of his or her environment. In such a world, law does not have the capacity to educate or to provide the basis for social harmony;30 rather, like any resource, law must be employed to more economic ends. The implication is that calculative thinking mandates that everything (including law) be subjected to a single will. While Heidegger recognized the danger of subjecting everything to a single will, the issue of whether, and when, he equated the danger with Nazi totalitarianism, which he had originally supported, would require a line of historical inquiry far beyond the scope of this article.31 Regardless of Heidegger’s own political and moral journey, Nazism effectively illustrates Heidegger’s philosophical fear—that technological thinking risks the “ordering” of all the world, including humanity, as resources subject to a singular will.

*We do not endorse the gendered language in this card*

**Belief in our ability to technologically manage the world is part of the problem. Complete control is never possible, but more often creates cycles of paralyzing anxiety and reactive desire to take action that only recreates the crisis**

**Peat, 08 –** theoretical physicist, Ph.D., founder of the Pari Centre for New Learning (F. David, “Gentle Action: Surviving Chaos and Change”, http://www.gentleaction.org/library/paper2.php)

Many rapid changes that are taking place around us. These include globalization, developments in technology; fears of terrorism, the instability of the Third World; the rise of the Pacific Rim and a United Europe; the breakdown of inner cities; economics that appear to be out of control with the consequent challenges of inflation, recession and unemployment; spiraling health costs; revolutions in communication technology and information processing; the demands of consumers and special interest groups; threatened species and ecologies; the dangers of global warming and ozone depletion; increasing rates of teenage suicide and drugs use; the transformation of management and the breakdown of conventional institutions. Governments, institutions, organizations and individuals experience considerable anxiety in the face of such rapid change and **feel powerless to ameliorate the problems** that surround them. Indeed, it sometimes appears as if their plans and policies, as well as the traditional structures of their institutions, **are themselves part of the problem**. In so many cases policies, plans, interventions and other actions, all taken in good faith, **have not only failed to resolve an existing situation but in many cases have acted to magnify and render the problem even more intractable.** In other cases, the attempt to impose a solution in one location or context **has had the effect of creating an even larger problem elsewhere**. Organizations and individuals feel control slipping from their grasp and their natural reaction is to become even more intransigent in their attempt to clamp down on events and exert ever more control. **The result is a spiral of control that has literally gone out of control!** The realization that plans and policies are ineffective leads to a sense of depression and hopelessness. Faced with the insecurities and flux of the modern world many institutions fall into a state that, where it to be detected in an individual, would be diagnosed as manic-depression! How did this cycle of anxiety, hopelessness, panic and the desire for ever more control arise? I would argue that it is a paradigm of thought and behavior that originates in our particular view of reality, a view, moreover, that modern science had now demonstrated to be fundamentally erroneous. Thus, when our perception of the world around us is astigmatic, the actions we take become increasingly inappropriate and incongruous. It is only by entering into new modes of perception and acknowledging a new paradigm of reality that more appropriate forms of action can be taken. The Myth of Control One of the great themes of Western civilization, a theme of virtually mythic proportions, involves the way in which nature has been tamed and controlled over the course of the last few thousand years. Other cultures and civilizations have, for example, developed the techniques of farming but it appears that only the civilizations that expanded from their Neolithic birthplace in Northern Europe and the Fertile Crescent of the near East possessed the hubris necessary to impose themselves to such a marked extent upon the landscape. Thus, even in prehistoric times, European forests were cleared, marshes drained, vast tracts of land converted to farming, and tracks and walkways established as human beings sought to recreate the landscape according to their own needs. And, as ever more powerful technologies and social control became available, this path of domination continued. Within our own time, social critics have pointed out that this desire to exert control has led to our distancing ourselves from the natural world. The effect has been for us to place an **increasing faith in human reason, science, technology and the effectiveness of plans**, directives **and policies** while, at the same time, to decrease our sensitivity for the complex and subtle nature of the world around us. In short, **we tend to stand outside the world**, like observers, **indulging in constant analysis,** **making predictions and exerting corrective control** when situations do not move in the direction we desire. When human society and its associated technology were relatively simple and localized, and the resources that it called upon were unlimited, then this pattern of control was relatively successful. But as societies attempt to deal with ever more complicated issues, their boundaries became more open, their resources are found to be finite, the environment fragile, and technologies and world economics become increasingly complex then these conventional approaches simply fail. Ultimately, by virtue of its early success, the desire to dominate grew to the point where **it began to subvert itself and**, in the process, **endangered the whole planet**. And increasingly actions taken in one sphere **have unintended consequences in another**. Engaging complexity Over the last decades, however, there have been indications of a remarkable transformation within this traditional vision; a revolution in the perception of ourselves, our culture and the nature of reality that is truly Copernican in its implications. Just as in the 16th century astronomical observations were to dethrone the human race from a central place in the universe, so too in our own century relativity, quantum theory, chaos theory and systems theory, along with new insights in psychology, ecology and economics, have demonstrated the fundamental fallacy of our belief in definitive control. At the same time they are affirming our basic connectedness to the whole of creation. These scientific insights happen to have come at a time when the world has been experiencing rapid revolutionary change. States have risen and fallen. The notion of government is being transformed. Institutions are questioning their effectiveness. Businesses are desperately searching for new ways of operating. Technologies have developed so rapidly that people are unable to keep up with their implications. The overall effect has been to create **a profound sense of anxiety**, a fear that things are out of control, that the future is increasingly uncertain and that we have been left with nothing to hang on to. Yet what if this anxiety actually **points to an essential truth about the world**, that ultimately control and definitive prediction are strictly limited and that we must discover new ways of being and acting? Our current economic, social, ecological, environmental and institutional systems are now enormously complex to the extent that **we may never have complete knowledge** **about the inner dynamics of** such **systems**, nor the ability to predict exactly or exert total control. In this we can draw on metaphors from the new sciences of quantum theory, chaos theory, systems theory, and so on which also indicate essential limits to prediction, description and control. It is for such reason that so many of our plans and policies have been unable to meet the complexities of the modern world and why some supposed "solutions" have created even deeper problems and more intractable situations. The myth of eternal progress and control that has lain behind Western civilization can no longer sustain itself. The island of order and certainty on which we have been living has turned out to be not solid land but a rapidly melting iceberg, and we have no alternative but to **plunge into the boiling sea of flux, uncertainty and change that surrounds us**. The Dilemma of Action These are the dilemmas that many organizations find themselves in today, dilemmas that translate into the anxieties and uncertainties faced by many individuals. Programmed by their goals and mission statements, as well as by their very structures, many organizations inevitably seek ways of exerting control and believe that they must always take positive action in the face of uncertainty. Yet increasingly they discover that these actions are inappropriate. And so organizations, institutions, governments, groups and individuals retrench, break apart or in some other way get trapped into a spiral of ineffective decision making, paralysis and anxiety. These organizations, governments and institutions have been created according to our traditional image of reality; that is, of **a world that is external to us, predictable, relatively mechanical, and whose dynamics can be controlled** by the application of directed force. As a result, organizations are themselves relatively rigid in their nature, operating from fixed plans, policies and mission statements. Their internal structures are often hierarchical in nature, their lines of communication are limited rather than being flexible and dynamic, and their response to challenge and change is often predictable. In other words, most organizations are far less subtle and complex than the very systems they are attempting to address. **The basic problem** facing our modern world **is:** **How can society respond to the flux and challenge of the modern world** when all its institutions are inflexible and over-simplistic? When situations move more rapidly than an organization is capable of responding, policies and programs are outdated even before they are put into operation. Rather than acting to render organizations and policies more flexible, the apparatus of modern technology tends to **rigidify and entrench the problems** and rigidities that already exist within an organization. Organizations are composed of individuals and here too the conditioning of our society tends to inhibit natural creativity and abilities. Just as organizations have areas of rigidity, limitations also apply to the psychology of the individual. The issue becomes, therefore, one of freeing and fostering the natural intelligence and creativity of individuals and allowing them to operate fully within society, governments and institutions. In other words, how can organizations and individuals transform themselves so that they can become as subtle, sensitive, intelligent and fast-responding as the world around them? How can institutions heal their separation from society; society from the individual; and the individual from the natural world? Creative Suspension Paradoxically it is the very effort to change that establishes an internal resistance and rigidity that sustains the blocks that are to be removed. The first step towards transformation lies in an act of "creative suspension" and "alert watchfulness". This is an action that has the effect of relevating and making manifest the internal dynamics, rigidities, fixed positions, unexamined paradigms, interconnections and lines and levels of communication within the organization and the individual. A form of "creative suspension" is taught to paramedics and rescue workers who have to deal with serious accidents. While a layperson may wish to rush in an "help", a professional will suspend immediate response in order to make a careful assessment of the whole situation and determine how to use resources most effectively. Likewise doctors and paramedics made a visual examination of the wounded before carefully touching and then determining what medical action should be taken. The nature of this creative suspension is related to other approaches and techniques whereby unexamined assumptions and rigidities are brought into conscious awareness. For example, Sigmund Freud's notion of "non-judgmental listening" as well as various meditative practices. Artists, composers, scientists and other creative people often describe how their work unfolds from a form of creative "listening". These acts of listening and watchfulness have the effect of dissolving rigidities and rendering a system more flexible. Of course the lights will begin to flash and the alarm bells ring. Like Pavlov's dog an organization is conditioned to react and respond. But what if it does nothing--but it a very watchful way, and this applies not only to organizations but to individuals as well? The first stage will be one of panic and chaos, a flow of commands and information. All of this is not being generated by any external threat but through the internal structure of the organization itself. By remaining sensitive to what it going on it may be possible to become aware of the whole nature of the organization, of its values, the way its information flows, its internal relationships, dynamics and, in particular, its fixed and inflexible responses-- the organizational neuroses and psychoses if you like. Arthur Koestler suggested that a scientific revolution is born out of the chaos as a paradigm breaks down. It is possible that something new and more flexible could be born out of the break-down of fixed patterns in an organization, policy group or individual. Through a very active watchfulness it may be possible to detect its unexamined presuppositions, fixed values and conditioned responses and in this way allow them to dissolve by no longer giving energy to support them. The idea would be to permit the full human potential for creativity within each individual to flower, it would enable people to relate together in a more harmonious way and human needs and values to be acknowledged. In this fashion the organization or group dies and is reborn. In its new form it becomes at least as flexible and sensitive as the situation it faces. Now, using science, human creativity and the art of working with complex systems it may be possible to perceive a complex system correctly and model it within the organization. This new understanding would be the basis for a novel sort of action, **one that** **harmonizes with nature and society**, that does not desire to dominate and control and but **seeks balance and good order** and is based on respect for nature and society. Gentle Action explores images of new organizations and institutions that would be able to sustain this watchfulness. In place of relatively mechanical, hierarchical and rule-bound organizations there would exist something more organic in nature. In place of relatively mechanical, hierarchical and rule-bound organizations there would exist something more organic in nature. By way of illustrate one could draw upon ideas and concepts in systems theory, Prigogine's dissipative structures, cooperative and coherent structures in biology, neural networks, quantum interconnectedness and non-locality. In such a way organizations will be able to reach a condition in which they are as sensitive, subtle and as intelligent as the systems and situations that surround them. New Organizations, New Dynamics With this increased flexibility, organizations will now be able to internalize and model the complex dynamics of the systems that surround them. Rather than seeking to predict and control, they will now be able to enter the flux of change and engage in those actions that are appropriate to each new situation.

**Hence, our alternative: do nothing.**

**Rejecting the call to action in the face of crisis opens space for solidarity to emerge through deep reflection on our relationship with the Earth.**

**McWhorter 92,** Professor of Philosophy at Northeast Missouri State, 92 (LaDelle, Heidegger and the Earth, ed: McWhorter, p. vii-viii)

Heidegger frustrates us. At a time when the stakes are so very high and decisive action is so loudly and urgently called for, Heidegger apparently calls us to do - nothing. If we get beyond the revulsion and anger that such a call initially inspires and actually examine the feasibility of response, we begin to undergo the frustration attendant upon paradox; **how is it possible, we ask, to choose, to will, to *do nothing****?* The call itself places in question the bimodal logic of activity and passivity; it points up the paradoxical nature of our passion for action, of our passion for maintaining control. **The call itself suggests that our drive for acting decisively and forcefully is part of what must be thought through, that** the narrow option of will versus surrender is one of the power configurations of current thinking that must be allowed to dissipate.But of course, those drives and those conceptual dichotomies are part of the very structure of our self-understanding both as individuals and as a tradition and a civilization. Hence, Heidegger's call is a threatening one, requiring great courage, "the courage to make the truth of our own presuppositions and the realm of our own goals into the things that most deserve to be called in question." Heidegger's work pushes thinking to think through the assumptions that underlie both our ecological vandalism and our love of scientific solutions, assumptions that also ground the most basic patterns of our current ways of being human.

### CP

The United States federal government should pass the comprehensive solution to address supply chain vulnerabilities in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. The United States federal government

The United States federal government should cancel all plans to remove its forces from, but allow negotiations over relocating bases within, Okinawa. The United States should promote co-location of Japanese and United States forces wherever possible within Okinawa, and allow the Japanese government to conduct environmental compliance inspections. The United States should offer Japan support for Okinawa’s economy, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, and smart grid technology assistance, and adopt a strategy of anticipatory public engagement through the Japan-US Educational Foundation.

**These specific basing concessions will solve the alliance**

**Cronin et al, 10** - Senior Advisor and the Senior Director of the Asia-Pacific Security Program

at the Center for a New American Security. (Patrick, “Renewal: Revitalizing the U.S.-Japan Alliance”, *October,*

http://cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Renewal\_CroninKlimanDenmark.pdf)

The United States should take additional measures to defuse local tensions stemming from the presence of American troops in Japan. It can encourage support for American bases (or at least reduce resentment) by granting local Japanese governments the right to conduct environmental inspections of American military facilities, an idea broached in a joint statement issued by the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee in May 2010.72 “Reasonable access” on environmental matters is something local governments in Japan currently desire, and a right that governments of individual U.S. states exercise over federal property, including military bases.

Whenever feasible, U.S. military bases should be co-located with Japanese bases to ease local concerns. Co-location has already occurred in Yokota with the groundbreaking establishment of a bilateral joint operations and coordination center.73 As the JSDF makes use of facilities traditionally limited to the U.S. military, an increasing number of “American” bases will fly Japanese flags, easing sovereignty concerns. Co-locating bases not only carries political advantages; it also contributes to greater interoperability between the U.S. military and the JSDF.74

Engaging in public outreach, offering “reasonable access" to American military facilities and even co-locating bases will not remedy the challenges that exist on Okinawa. The U.S. footprint there will remain intrusive – American facilities cover almost 20 percent of the island.75 Plus, while U.S. bases on Okinawa create jobs, the island ranks as the poorest of Japan’s 47 prefectures, adding to the level of preexisting frustration.76

Although tensions on Okinawa will never fully dissipate so long as intrusive military bases remain there, the United States and Japan can mitigate popular frustration by renewing long-dormant efforts to revitalize Okinawa’s economy. The two governments should scale up an experimental “smart grid” in Okinawa into a “green Okinawa” initiative.77 This would entail investing further to improve the island’s energy efficiency and promote the use of renewable power sources such as solar and wind. A “green Okinawa” initiative could ultimately transform the island, boosting local economic growth and creating jobs.78

#### CP solves dependence

**Conclusion of your Green Article, ’12** (http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ib112)

The Way Forward. Despite these concerns, members of Congress remain focused on developing a comprehensive solution to address supply chain vulnerabilities. The House of Representatives’ version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 creates new duties for the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, including oversight of policy and of Defense Department critical materials-related activities, as well as ensuring a secure supply of critical materials. The House bill explicitly mentions rare earth elements. It also requires recommendations to prevent the export to China of heavy rare earth elements from recycled U.S. government fluorescent lighting.14 Conclusion. One of the tremendous benefits of globalization has been the opening of world markets to American products, but the concomitant pursuit of the lowest cost raw materials has begun to adversely affect national security — as have imports of low-cost counterfeit electronic parts. There is a silver lining though. With sound domestic policies, we can reconstitute the capability to meet defense demands, but only when the Defense Department and concerned elected officials (whose ranks are now swelling) work together.

### DA

**Obama PC is key to convincing the GOP to compromise on the debt ceiling and sequestration now – failure causes global economic collapse**

Michael Shear and Jonathan Weisman (writers for the International Herald Tribune) January 3, 2013 “Republicans ready for another battle; Beaten on tax increase, they're spoiling to take on U.S. borrowing limit” Lexis

President Barack Obama's eyes narrowed late Tuesday, just hours after a divided House of Representatives passed legislation to avert big income tax increases on most Americans and prevent major spending cuts, as he looked sternly into the cameras and fired a warning shot in Republicans' direction. After the bruising year-end go-around with congressional Republicans on taxes and spending, he said he had no intention of getting pulled into a new negotiation, this one over raising the nation's borrowing limit or facing a default on government debt. ''I will not have another debate with this Congress over whether or not they should pay the bills that they've already racked up through the laws that they passed,'' the president said, pausing to repeat himself. ''We can't not pay bills that we've already incurred.'' But it is not clear exactly how Mr. Obama can avoid it. Following the president's fiscal victory - which will raise tax rates for the wealthy but do little to rein in spending - Republicans in Congress are betting that their refusal to raise the $16.4 trillion debt ceiling will force Mr. Obama to the bargaining table on spending cuts and issues like reform of Medicare and Social Security. Doing so would inevitably reprise the clash over the debt ceiling in the summer of 2011, when the government came close to defaulting before lawmakers and the president agreed to a $1.2 trillion package of spending cuts in exchange for Republican agreement to raise the debt ceiling by about the same amount. That is exactly what Republicans want. The party's caucus in the House will discuss a debt ceiling strategy at a retreat this month in Williamsburg, Virginia, a top Republican aide said. Party members are determined to insist again on spending cuts that equal the increase in the amount the country is authorized to borrow, the aide said. ''The speaker told the president to his face that everything you want in life comes with a price - that doesn't change here,'' the aide said, referring to John A. Boehner, speaker of the House, which is controlled by the Republicans. ''I don't think he has any choice.'' That strategy could risk a new round of criticism aimed at Republicans from a public fed up by Washington brinksmanship. The 2011 fight ended with a last-minute deal, but led to a downgrade in the rating of the United States' debt and a slump in the economic recovery. But Brendan Buck, a spokesman for Mr. Boehner, said Republicans had made it clear what they wanted in exchange for a willingness to allow borrowing to increase. ''If they want to get the debt limit raised, they are going to have to engage and accept that reality,'' Mr. Buck said. ''The president knows that.'' Mr. Obama also knows that the Republicans he is dealing with are not the Republicans of years past; battle lines and basic demands have shifted, complicating political calculations on both sides. Just a few years ago, the new tax deal would have been a Republican fiscal fantasy, a sweeping bill that locks in virtually all of the Bush-era tax cuts, exempts almost all estates from taxation, and enshrines the former president's credo that dividends and capital gains should be taxed equally and gently. But times have changed. Before the bill's final passage on Tuesday, House Republican leaders struggled all day to quell a revolt among caucus members who threatened to blow up a hard-fought compromise that they could easily have framed as a victory. Many House Republicans seemed almost determined to put themselves in a position to be blamed for sending the economy into a tailspin under the weight of automatic tax increases and spending cuts. The latest internal party struggle on Capitol Hill surprised even Senate Republicans, who had voted overwhelmingly for a deal largely hashed out by their leader, Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, along with Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr.; only 5 of the chamber's 47 Republicans voted no. Yet 21 hours later, the same measure was opposed by 151 of the 236 Republicans voting in the House. It was further proof that House Republicans are a new breed, less enamored of tax cuts per se than they are driven to shrink government through steep spending cuts. Protecting nearly 99 percent of the nation's households from an income tax increase, as the bill will do, was not enough if taxes rose on some and government spending was untouched. The Republicans' intense focus on cutting spending is not news to the White House; it has been on notice for months that Republicans view the debt ceiling as leverage in the next budget fight. Now, the question is what Mr. Obama and his advisers can do to avoid that fight. Mr. Obama will have to make sure that lawmakers in his own party hold firm. While the president no longer has to worry about another election, Democratic lawmakers in the House and Senate do, and they may be more willing to negotiate in order to avoid a potential government default. The White House might also turn to business executives for help. Many top executives fear that a debt ceiling crisis could wallop the U.S. economy just as it is beginning to grow again - and just as the new fiscal deal brings some of the tax certainty that the financial community has long demanded. Those executives might try to pressure Republican lawmakers not to use the country's credit as a negotiating tool. Mr. Obama might also take to the road again, using the power of his office to secure public backing for his argument that another debt-ceiling fight could bring economic crisis. Public surveys after the last debt ceiling fight suggested that people largely blamed Republicans for the threat of a default. The president and his aides have signaled that they will try to explain to the public that the increase in the borrowing limit is needed to cover debts that the government has incurred. Mr. Obama offered a dire warning in his statement on Tuesday of what would happen if the country did not meet its obligations. ''If Congress refuses to give the United States government the ability to pay these bills on time,'' he said, ''the consequences for the entire global economy would be catastrophic - far worse than the impact of a fiscal cliff.'' The fiscal bill not only worked up the dander of many Republicans; it gave some Democrats pause, since it would make permanent virtually all of the Bush tax cuts. That is a goal that President George W. Bush spent years chasing, and the achievement of which Ari Fleischer, a Bush press secretary, called ''fantastic'' even while bemoaning the failure to bring down spending levels. It would make permanent five of the six income tax rates created in 2001 by the first Bush tax cut. It would codify Mr. Bush's successful push, in 2003, to make tax rates on dividends and capital gains equal so that one form of investment income is not favored over the other. Democrats say they had little choice. The Bush White House and Republican Congresses structured the tax cuts so that letting them expire would be politically difficult. Add the across-the-board spending cuts if Congress did nothing, and Mr. Obama felt he had to extend most of the tax cuts or watch the economy sink back into recession. ''New occasions make for new truths,'' said Representative Danny K. Davis, an Illinois Democrat and a veteran of the partisan wars over the Bush tax cuts. ''New situations make ancient remedies uncouth.'' Most galling for Republicans are provisions projected to add $330 billion in spending over 10 years, including $30 billion in unemployment compensation and $21 billion in payments to Medicare health providers. None of those provisions are objectionable on its own, but collectively they proved almost impossible for Republicans to accept. In the coming days and weeks, Mr. Obama is likely to try to focus negotiations on another looming issue: how to avoid deep, across-the-board cuts to military and domestic programs. The deal passed on Tuesday postpones those cuts for two months, but Mr. Obama and lawmakers in both parties are eager to avoid them, with Republicans focused more on military cuts and Democrats on domestic programs. Instead, the president wants a debate over spending cuts and tax changes that would remove loopholes and deductions for wealthy Americans. That fight is coming. The question is whether the president can avoid conducting it in the middle of a nasty, drawn-out debate over the debt limit.

#### Exports unpopular – almost every constituency

**Levi, ’12** David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and Director of the CFR program on energy security and climate change (Michael Levi, The Hamilton Project, June 2012, “A Strategy for US Natural Gas Exports,” <http://www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads_and_links/06_exports_levi.pdf)//CC>

A revolution in U.S. natural gas production has forced policymakers to decide whether they should allow exports of LNG from the United States. They should say yes, within prudent limits, and leverage U.S. exports for broader gain. Yet the mere fact that the benefits of allowing exports would outweigh the costs does not mean that the political fight over allowing LNG exports will be tame. Operators of natural gas power plants will likely oppose exports, as will energy intensive manufacturers, though chemicals producers, if they are sufficiently enlightened, may take a more moderate stance. Most environmental advocates who are concerned with the local impacts of shale gas development will likely join in opposition, as will those who are convinced that gas should be trapped for use in cars and trucks, and those who believe that any rise in consumer energy prices is unacceptable. The most prominent proponents of exports will likely be oil and gas companies and advocates of liberal trade, perhaps along with a broader group of foreign policy strategists that finds the prospect of disrupting relations between gas-producing and gas-consuming countries appealing, as well as supporters of renewable power who see cheap natural gas as competition (Schrag 2012). Any decision on LNG exports is likely to be controversial. Enlightened leadership and a strategy that mitigates downsides for poorer consumers and the local environment are essential to a smart strategy for constructively moving exports forward.

**The plan obliterates any chance for compromise—Obama won’t have the negotiating position**

Richard McGregor (writer for the Financial Times) January 2, 2013 “Fiscal fights threaten US policy goals” <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/8f8ef804-5501-11e2-a628-00144feab49a.html?ftcamp=published_links%2Frss%2Fworld%2Ffeed%2F%2Fproduct#axzz2GtNWiw3I>

In the short term, fiscal fights will dominate politics for months to come and threaten to crowd out serious consideration of other issues, with a large potential downside for the economy in 2013. The fiscal cliff compromise alone will act as a drag on the economy, largely because of the end of the payroll tax holiday, which had added substantially to middle-class incomes, economists said. “The economy needs a stimulus, but under the agreement, taxes will go up in 2013 relative to 2012,” said William Gale of the Tax Policy Center in Washington in a blog post. “For most households, the payroll tax takes a far bigger bite than the income tax does, and the payroll tax cut therefore was a more effective stimulus than income tax cuts were.” The forthcoming confrontations will probably have a similar impact, as Republicans feel they enter talks over raising the debt ceiling in the coming weeks playing a far stronger hand than they had in the fiscal cliff. Under the fiscal cliff, taxes were going up no matter what Republicans did. The debt ceiling, however, cannot be lifted unless they vote for it. Barack Obama’s new cabinet will form the backbone of his administration, setting the tone for his second term in the White House Dave Camp, who chairs the congressional committee overseeing tax policy, said that House Republicans had not settled on a strategy for the debt ceiling but the central aim was to leverage it to cut spending further. “Before we raise the debt limit we have to reduce spending,” Mr Camp said. Many Republicans are less diplomatic in private and see the debt ceiling fight as a chance to get revenge both on the White House and the dealmakers within their own party for being forced into accepting a tax increase this week. Of all the issues crowding Mr Obama’s agenda, immigration has the best hope of passing in some form, as the disastrous vote recorded by Republicans among minorities in 2012 gives them a huge incentive to address the issue. But on everything else, with the Republicans remaining in control of the House, Mr Obama needs all the skills of cajoling, seducing and manipulating Congress that he has so far shown no signs of developing. “I find it remarkable that the president apparently continues to believe that he will not have to deal with people that he does not agree with,” said Mr Galston. “A president who is not disdainful of the art of legislating can get things done.” Forging a consensus on issues such as gun control and climate change, if the White House does take them on, will require Mr Obama to do more than just persuade some Republicans to support him. Many Democrats are wary of such reforms or oppose them outright, and a second-term president with declining political capital will face an uphill battle to shift their views.

**Economic collapse causes global nuclear war**

Friedberg and Schoenfeld, 2008[Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>]

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

### China

**Global diversification is inevitable**

**Lee, 11** - fellow at the Center for Independent Studies in Sydney and the Hudson Institute (John, Beijing's Motives Behind Rare-Earth Metals, Forbes, 1/3, <http://www.forbes.com/2011/01/03/china-rare-earth-opinions-contributors-john-lee.html>)

Even before the current announcement to cut export quotas by 35%, Beijing had been cutting export quotas of rare earth metals to regional 'strategic competitors' such as Japan by an average of 6% each year over the past decade. In 2009, China only sold 38,000 metric tonnes to Japan--the approximate amount that Japanese manufacturers [**Toyota**](http://finapps.forbes.com/finapps/jsp/finance/compinfo/CIAtAGlance.jsp?tkr=TM) ( [TM](http://finapps.forbes.com/finapps/jsp/finance/compinfo/CIAtAGlance.jsp?tkr=TM) - [news](http://search.forbes.com/search/CompanyNewsSearch?ticker=TM)-[people](http://people.forbes.com/search?ticker=TM)) and [**Honda**](http://finapps.forbes.com/finapps/jsp/finance/compinfo/CIAtAGlance.jsp?tkr=HMC) ( [HMC](http://finapps.forbes.com/finapps/jsp/finance/compinfo/CIAtAGlance.jsp?tkr=HMC) - [news](http://search.forbes.com/search/CompanyNewsSearch?ticker=HMC)- [people](http://people.forbes.com/search?ticker=HMC)) needed in all of 2008. The country's Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT) released a white paper in 2009 proposing to severely scale back, or even halt all exports of rare earth metals. Subsequently, China made a decision to slash exports of all rare metals by 72% in the second half of 2010. The decision to slash export quotas in the first half of 2011 means that only 14,508 tonnes will be sold to foreign markets from January to June.

Beijing knows that governments and mining companies around the world will respond by reopening existing mines and developing new ones outside China. Indeed, the production of these metals is being accelerated by miners operating in countries such as Australia, Mongolia, Thailand and Ukraine. But reviving defunct mines and opening new ones require significant capital and will take several years. As Wang Caifeng, a former senior official with MIIT recently boasted, China is well positioned to hold its bellwether position in the global rare-earth industry in the long-term.

**International pressure against China proves it won’t cut off shipments**

**LaMonica, 10** (Martin, CNET, Pay dirt: Why rare earth metals matter to tech (FAQ), 11/1, <http://news.cnet.com/8301-11128_3-20021139-54.html>)

In recent weeks, China unofficially created an embargo on the export of rare earth metals, which was [lifted last week](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/29/business/energy-environment/29rare.html?_r=1&hp), perhaps because of international pressure, according to reports in The New York Times. A diplomatic dispute between Japan and China over territory led China in September to temporarily suspend shipments of rare earth elements to Japan, a move that caught the world's attention.

**No impact**

**Goldstein 2011**, Professor IR at American University [Joshua S. Goldstein, Professor emeritus of international relations at American University, “Thing Again: War,” Sept/Oct 2011,

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/think\_again\_war?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full]

Nor do shifts in the global balance of power doom us to a future of perpetual war. While some political scientists argue that an increasingly multipolar world is an increasingly volatile one -- that peace is best assured by the predominance of a single hegemonic power, namely the United States -- **recent geopolitical history** suggests otherwise. Relative U.S. power and worldwide conflict have **waned in tandem** over the past decade. The exceptions to the trend, Iraq and Afghanistan, have been lopsided wars waged by the hegemon, not challenges by up-and-coming new powers. The best precedent for today's emerging world order may be the 19th-century Concert of Europe, a collaboration of great powers that largely maintained the peace for a century until its breakdown and the bloodbath of World War I.

**Zero studies exist to confirm that primacy is peaceful**

**Montiero, 12** - Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University (Nuno, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity is Not Peaceful” International Security, Winter, http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00064)

In contrast, the question of unipolar peacefulness has received **virtually no attention**. Although the past decade has witnessed a resurgence of security studies, with much scholarship on such conflict-generating issues as terrorism, preventive war, military occupation, insurgency, and nuclear proliferation, no one has systematically connected any of them to unipolarity. This silence is unjustified. The first two decades of the unipolar era have been anything but peaceful. U.S. forces have been deployed in four interstate wars: Kuwait in 1991, Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan from 2001 to the present, and Iraq between 2003 and 2010. 22 In all, the United States has been at war for thirteen of the twenty-two years since the end of the Cold War. 23 Put another way, the first two decades of unipolarity, which make up less than 10 percent of U.S. history, account for more than 25 percent of the nation’s total time at war. 24 And yet, the theoretical consensus continues to be that unipolarity encourages peace. Why? To date, scholars do not have a theory of how unipolar systems operate. 25 The debate on whether, when, and how unipolarity will end (i.e., the debate on durability) has all but monopolized our attention.

### Japan

#### Exports inevitable – new study and administration statement

**Johnson and Tracy, 12/6** (Keith Johnson and Tennille Tracy, Wall Street Journal, 6 December 2012, “U.S. Gas Exports Clear Hurdle,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324001104578161461770971222.html)//CC

Shipping some of the newly abundant U.S. natural gas overseas would benefit the nation's economy more than keeping it all at home, according to a long-awaited government study that has the potential to reshape the global energy market. The endorsement could turn the tide in a politically sensitive issue. Gas producers are eager to export more, while big consumers including manufacturers and chemical companies are leery that exports could raise domestic prices. Environmental groups, meanwhile, fear that allowing exports would encourage more natural-gas production. The administration had said the study would be central to its decision on approving exports. It analyzed more than a dozen scenarios for U.S. production and exports of natural gas. It found that "across all these scenarios, the U.S. was projected to gain net economic benefits" from liquefying and then exporting natural gas.

#### Lugar’s bill independently solves the aff – it’s distinct from the regulations in your ev

**Johnsen, 12/12** (Erika Johnsen, HotAir, 12 December 2012, “Lugar: Natural gas exports can be a geopolitical weapon,” http://hotair.com/archives/2012/12/12/lugar-natural-gas-exports-can-be-a-geopolitical-weapon/)//CC

Sen. Lugar, who is leaving the chamber at the end of the year, is introducing the “Liquefied Natural Gas for NATO Act,” which would essentially open the door to exports of U.S. gas to members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization who aren’t free-trade partners of the U.S. (Gas exports to free-trade countries are automatically approved; exports to other countries have to go through a long government approval process.) The idea is to give U.S. allies in Europe, who for decades have lived under the shadow of Russian energy bullying, a way out of their impasse, something that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has stressed recently. Important U.S. allies across Europe depend to a large degree on imports of Russian gas—and Moscow in recent years, unlike during the Cold War, has not shied away from using gas exports as a political weapon. The legislation is meant to accelerate the degree to which U.S. gas can undermine Russia’s dominance in Europe. At the same time, by offering NATO allies such as Turkey an alternate source of gas, it could help them wean off Iranian natural gas—which would further U.S. interests in economically isolating Tehran. Lugar’s pending exit-stage-left means that he won’t be able to see the legislation all the way through, but staffers expect that other senators will pick it up again next year. I don’t doubt it, seeing as how it will likely be another powerful argument for free-trade advocates in the upcoming LNG-export tug-of-war. Allowing for more free trade in no way guarantees that our gas exports would go to our allies, as that would still be determined by the supplies and demands of the free market — but the point is, even the possibility of that outcome is currently prohibited by U.S. policy.

#### They have the advantage backward – supply is low now BECAUSE exports are prohibited; prices are too low, and exports increase them

**Levi, ’12** David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and Director of the CFR program on energy security and climate change (Michael Levi, The Hamilton Project, June 2012, “A Strategy for US Natural Gas Exports,” <http://www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads_and_links/06_exports_levi.pdf)//CC>

The market has signaled its endorsement of this development by hammering natural gas prices. U.S. benchmark natural gas dipped below $2 for a thousand cubic feet in early 2012, and as of mid-April 2012, delivery of the same amount in March 2015 could be assured for $4.43. Wellhead prices, meanwhile, fell to levels unseen since 1995. 1 But the world looks different from overseas. In Europe, a thousand cubic feet of gas sold on the spot market for about $11 as of March 2012, and in East Asia, the price was north of $15 (Platts 2012). These prices are all the more striking since it costs roughly $4 to liquefy and ship a thousand cubic feet of natural gas from the United States to Europe, and only about $2 more to send it to Asia (Morse et al. 2012). Yet the United States does not export natural gas to those markets. Many have thus argued that it is leaving money on the table. The potential profits from exports have prompted several companies to apply for permits to export liquefied natural gas (LNG) without restriction. In March 2011, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) approved the first such permit, for Cheniere Energy, and in April 2012, the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee (FERC) approved Cheniere’s Sabine Pass, Louisiana facility. As of May 2012, another eight projects had applied to the DOE for similar permits, and four more had applied for permits to export LNG to countries with which the United States has free trade agreements (DOE 2012). The DOE has signaled that it will begin making decisions on these applications after receiving the results of a contractor study on the possible impacts of LNG exports in late summer 2012. The DOE can be expected to solicit input from several agencies, including the Departments of State and Commerce, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, as well as from the National Economic Council, the National Security Council, and the Council on Environmental Quality in making its ultimate decisions. Indeed, if currently anticipated price differences hold up, and fully free trade in natural gas is allowed, several developers will likely attempt to build LNG export terminals. A wide range of analysts have claimed that as many as six billion cubic feet of daily exports by the end of the decade is plausible. That trade could expand U.S. gas production substantially and, in principle, net U.S. producers, exporters, and their suppliers north of $10 billion a year. 2 Gas exports could help narrow the U.S. current account deficit, shake up geopolitics, and give the United States new leverage in trade negotiations. This has led many people to advocate for a U.S. policy that allows—or even encourages—natural gas exports.

#### timeframe – 2015

**Levi, ’12** David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and Director of the CFR program on energy security and climate change (Michael Levi, The Hamilton Project, June 2012, “A Strategy for US Natural Gas Exports,” <http://www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads_and_links/06_exports_levi.pdf)//CC>

However, no major LNG importer other than South Korea has an applicable FTA with the United States (Ratner et al. 2011). Would-be exporters have thus sought approval to export without restriction. Cheniere Energy’s Sabine Pass Facility has received DOE and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approval for 2.2 billion cubic feet of daily LNG exports to non-FTA countries, and applications totaling another 10.3 billion cubic feet per day are under review. These combined applications involve total volumes similar to current U.S. LNG import capacity (Guegel 2010). Exports from the first facilities would start no earlier than 2015

#### Exports won’t happen – price undercuts

**Levi, ’12** David M. Rubenstein Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) and Director of the CFR program on energy security and climate change (Michael Levi, The Hamilton Project, June 2012, “A Strategy for US Natural Gas Exports,” <http://www.hamiltonproject.org/files/downloads_and_links/06_exports_levi.pdf)//CC>

It is far from clear that all or even most of this export volume would be used even if it were approved. A recent MIT study looked at nine scenarios for U.S. and world natural gas markets; none of them led to the emergence of significant U.S. natural gas exports, in large part because other lower cost producers undercut prices offered by the United States in distant markets (MIT 2011). Other forces, discussed in Chapter 2, could also lead global natural gas prices to converge even without U.S. exports, removing opportunities for economically attractive U.S. LNG sales. Indeed, most analysts anticipate that less LNG will be exported than currently pending permits would allow, even if all of those were approved. (They also expect to see more permit applications, since the plans behind many of the pending ones are expected to eventually fizzle.) For example, Citigroup analysts foresee up to 5 billion cubic feet a day of LNG exports by the end of the decade, barring regulatory barriers (Morse et al. 2012). UK gas producer BG has projected up to six billion cubic feet a day by then (Gismatullin 2012), the same volume that Deloitte (2011) analysts have focused their modeling on. Given this consistent view among market analysts on the maximum likely volume of LNG exports from the United States, the main analysis in this paper focuses on the possibility of up to six billion cubic feet of daily exports. This is approximately half the capacity currently awaiting approval and almost ten percent of current U.S. natural gas production. I consider the possibility of significantly greater or lesser exports in Chapter 6; the qualitative conclusions do not change, though the specific costs and benefits of allowing LNG exports do. To provide some context, Figure 2 shows natural gas consumption and LNG trade by region.

**Cooperation inevitable—disputes won’t manifest in a weaker alliance**

**Bader 10** Jeffrey 6/7, Senior fellow at Brookings- Director of the John L. Thornton China Center, 6/7/10 [Keynote Speech: US-Japan Alliance at 50: Toward a Reenergized Partnership” http://stimson.org/japan/pdf/Transcript\_Jeff\_Bader.pdf]

The sinking of the South Korean naval vessel, Cheonan, by North Korea served as a dramatic reminder that Northeast Asia is still “a dangerous neighborhood.” The Japanese Cabinet noticed. The Japanese government also experienced some difficulties in its relationship with China, in which it had invested a considerable amount. The DPJ has come to understand with increasing clarity that others in the region have been watching closely the U.S.-Japan alliance, and Japan could not afford the impression of a rift to “gain traction.” It turns out that all politics is not 100 percent local, as it had been seen in Japan for some months before then. The decision came against a series of other policy decisions by the Japanese government that demonstrate that the alliance is about more than basing issues. Japan has allocated $900 million in its current budget towards a multi-year, $5 billion, pledge to the Afghan Army and police, including for rehabilitation and training of demobilized Taliban and important development projects. Japan, like the United States, believes that peace and security in Afghanistan depend significantly on stability in Pakistan, and Tokyo has pledged $1 billion in assistance to Pakistan and hosted a major pledging conference. Japan has strongly backed the Republic of Korea, in the face of aggression from the North, in the wake of the Cheonan incident. Its solidarity with South Korea has been firm and public. Japan has sought trilateral cooperation with the U.S. and South Korea, and taken a leading role in fashioning a UN Security Council response. As a member of the UN Security Council, this year, Japan is supporting the U.S.–led draft of a resolution on Iran. Prime Minister Kan – Prime Minister to be Kan – indeed reiterated that support in his first conversation with President Obama, this past week. Japan’s leadership has made clear recently that it favors U.S. participation in an eventual East Asian Community, a change taken from the DPJ position last fall. Japan strongly supported President Obama’s initiatives in the April Nuclear Security Summit and worked closely with the U.S. delegation at the NPT Review Conference in May. So, nine months after the DPJ’s electoral victory, the scorecard, from the U.S. perspective, at last, is positive and improving. There has been lots of attention to what a rough ride it has been, to the precipitous decline in Hatoyama’s polling numbers and, ultimately, his demise, his political demise, to the difficulties of the DPJ government in “getting its feet under it.” And now the – as I said – the resignation. I’ll leave to experts on Japan the analysis of these, but from the viewpoint of the U.S., the larger issue, in conclusion, is this: That Japan has gone through the single most dramatic political change in 50 years – after 50 years of stasis in party rule, and the U.S.-Japan alliance has emerged in sound condition, having been scrutinized and ultimately validated by the new political leadership. This is, in one sense, not surprising, since 80 percent of all Japanese, in polling, support the alliance.\*\* That is the indispensible foundation for the alliance.

**No impact to the alliance**

Anthony DiFilippo, Prof. Sociology at Lincoln University, 2002, The Challenges of the U.S.-Japan Military Arrangement: Competing Security Transitions in a Changing International Environment, pg. 13

One thing that has not changed about the U.S.-Japan security alliance in the fifty years that it has existed is that it is supposed to have maintained regional stability. If stability is defined as a state where war or the high level threat of war does not exist, then the alliance has not been terribly effective. Although the Soviet Union never attacked Japan during the Cold War, other serious destabilizing forces have appeared despite the continued existence of the bilateral alliance. The Korean War, which began in June 1950, did not end after the signing of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty in 1951 nor after the accord went into effect in 1952. The alliance did not prevent China from developing nuclear weapons-hardly a stabilizing event in the region. The U.S.-Japan alliance did not prevent or end the Vietnam War. More recently, the U.S.-Japan security alliance did not stop the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) from beginning a nuclear weapons program in the early 1990s, thwart Pyongyang's missile development efforts, or discourage it from launching a projectile over Japan without prior notice in August 1998. With the bilateral alliance in effect for decades, China went ahead with nuclear testing in 1995 to assure that its nuclear arsenal was capable of neutralizing the threats it perceives from the other nuclear powers.